

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report  
For CDRU # 6250 Case file # 95-246669.

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in a trial, transcript not provided by prosecutor.

# INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 12:00 PM (Time), 03/14/2001 (Date)

File #: 95-246669

Laboratory #(s): 11201050

20216008

### Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
UL	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of:

Testimony Date(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Pages: \_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number:	11201050	Date:	Jan 8, 1982
Laboratory Number:	20216008	Date:	Feb 25, 1982
Laboratory Number:		Date:	

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ

Laboratory Number: 11201050  
20216008

Page 1 of 3

Initials: *SM*

CRM - 3162

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letters (dated 11-16-81 and 2-8-82)

### Results of Review

File #: 95-246669

Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q6-Q8, K1, K2

#### Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?  
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?  
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine

#### Review of Testimony:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

☒ Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SGC

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.  
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-246669

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, even with the best notes, there is no way to determine the comparison was performed correctly.

#2: The examination results set forth in the laboratory report are supported by the bench notes, but the documentation is marginally adequate. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil. RQ uses abbreviations to indicate the microscopic characteristics of the hair. These abbreviations are difficult to interpret.

Review completed at: 12:15 PM (Time), 03/14/2001 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0:15 hours

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Tim Roberts

(Signature)

03/14/2001

(Date)

Page 3 of 3

Initials: SR